CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

ORDER NO. 89-138

SITE CLEANUP REQUIREMENTS FOR:

CLIFFORD B. HUNTER, INC. (formerly HUNTER TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION), HUNTER TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION COMPANY doing business as HUNTER TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,
MONSANTO COMPANY, and
CAMSI IV

FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT:

2710 LAFAYETTE STREET
SANTA CLARA
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region (hereinafter called the Board) finds that:

1. SITE DESCRIPTION Monsanto Company (hereinafter referred to as Monsanto) owned 25 acres of property at 2710 Lafayette Street in Santa Clara (hereinafter referred to as the Site). Eight acres of the Site were used to manufacture plastics and resins from 1950 until 1983. In 1968, Monsanto leased a building at 985 Walsh Avenue on the Site to Hunter Technology Corporation, which is now Clifford B. Hunter, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as Hunter), who manufactured printed circuit boards until 1983. In 1983, Monsanto negotiated an exchange of the Site with TICOR Title Insurance. TICOR sold the Site to Ronald N. Sakauye who sold the Site to Kimball Small Properties in 1984. Kimball Small Properties held title to the Site until the CAMSI IV partnership was formed in 1985. CAMSI IV currently owns the Site. All buildings were demolished by Kimball Small Properties in 1984. No new facilities have been constructed and the Site exists as an open field.

2. REGULATORY STATUS Monsanto (hereinafter referred to as a discharger) is a discharger because of their ownership and occupancy of the Site for thirty three years and because the types of chemicals used by Monsanto and/or their tenant have been found in the soil and groundwater on the Site. Hunter (hereinafter referred to as a discharger) is a discharger because the types of volatile organic chemicals (VOCs) used and metals produced in Hunter's industrial processes have been found in the soil and groundwater in

the area of their former facility. Hunter Technology Acquisition Company (hereinafter referred to as a discharger), doing business as Hunter Technology Corporation, is a discharger because Hunter Technology Acquisition Company may share some liability for releases which occurred from Hunter Technology Corporation and because the solvency of Clifford B. Hunter is uncertain at this time. CAMSI IV (hereinafter referred to as a discharger) is a discharger because they are the current owner of the Site and will be responsible for compliance only in the event that Monsanto and Hunter fail to comply with the requirements of this Order. If additional information is submitted indicating that the other previous property owners or any other parties caused or permitted any waste to be discharged or deposited on the Site where it entered or could have entered waters of the State, the Board will consider adding that party's name to this Order.

3. SITE HISTORY Monsanto disposed liquid waste (water with some salts mixed with amino and phenolic resins) in a two-acre back-wash area from the middle of the 1960s to 1975. Monsanto also buried solid waste (resins, construction debris, domestic refuse) in seven trenches just north of Walsh Avenue during the 1950s and 1960s. Additionally, Monsanto stored organic solvents, diesel fuel, and other chemicals in several above ground tanks east of the back-wash area. Hunter occupied a building east of the buried trenches where they used VOCs and operated a sump where rinse wastewaters were temporarily stored.

4. HYDROGEOLOGY Soils beneath the Site appear to be primarily clays, silty clays, and clayey silts to a depth of about 15 feet below the ground surface. These shallow soils are reported to have abundant root holes. Lenses of coarse silts, sands, and some gravel are reported to be found below 15 feet in some locations. The shallow groundwater generally appears to be 10 to 15 feet below ground surface, but was recently reported to be at levels of about 16 to 18 feet below ground surface. Groundwater in this zone appears to move in a north-east, north, and northwest, direction, depending on the particular area of the site. The next significant water bearing zone appears to be an eight-foot thick sand and gravel lens from 58 to 66 feet below ground surface, based on one well (OW-1B) installed to these depths. A downward vertical gradient has been reported at observation well cluster OW-1/OW-1B. In general, the shallow soils encountered on the eastern portion of the Site are more permeable than those encountered on the western portion.

5. ADJACENT FACILITY Technical Coatings Company, a subsidiary of Benjamin Moore and Company, owns a 5.1 acre site located at 1000 Walsh Avenue in Santa Clara. Technical Coatings Company has been manufacturing paint at this site since 1950. The Technical Coatings site is south of the Site, in the upgradient direction, across Walsh Avenue. Soil and groundwater

sampling results from the Technical Coatings site indicate that a release of VOCs has occurred and VOCs have migrated onto the Site.

6. SOIL AND GROUNDWATER INVESTIGATIONS Subsurface investigations were conducted for Monsanto, beginning in 1981, and included the following activities: installation of 45 groundwater monitoring wells, subsurface sampling and analysis, 4 soil gas/groundwater probe surveys (January, March and December 1987, and June 1988), trenching in the former location of the building occupied by Hunter (July 1988) and in the above ground tanks area (January 1989), and a soil and groundwater probe/boring survey (January 1989). Results of these investigations indicate that chemicals have been released at this Site in at least the four areas discussed below.

The METALS AREA is believed to be the source of the TCE that has been detected in some onsite wells and in one offsite well (19A). Results of analyses on soil samples in this area (the former location of Hunter's facility) indicate that TCE was detected in concentrations ranging from ND to 290 parts per billion. Copper and lead were also detected in this vicinity above the Toxic Threshold Limit Concentrations for these two metals. The results of analysis on a water sample from onsite, downgradient well OW-3, reported in May 1987, indicated the presence of 1900 ppb of TCE and results of analysis on a water sample from OW-14, located in the presumed source area, indicated the presence of 4600 ppb of TCE, as reported in January 1989. The TCE plume appears to have migrated offsite based on sampling results in offsite, downgradient well 19A.

In the HMBA AREA, results of analysis on a soil sample from boring 16B, reported in June 1986, indicated the presence of 12,000 ppb of HMBA. Results of analysis on a water sample from well 10A, analyzed in June 1982 and reported in August 1985, indicated the presence of 830,000 ppb of HMBA. Between 1981 and 1986, all the sampled wells in this area had detectable levels of HMBA. Currently, most of the wells in this area have non-detectable levels of HMBA. Other chemicals detected in wells in this vicinity have also been detected in an offsite, downgradient well (18A).

In the ABOVE GROUND TANK AREA, results of analyses on soil samples indicate that ethylbenzene was detected in concentrations ranging from ND to 58,000 ppb and total xylenes were detected in concentrations ranging from ND to 220,000 ppb. These and other chemicals detected in the soil in this area have not been detected in the groundwater wells in this area.

In the FORMER BURIED TRENCH AREA, results of analysis on a composite soil sample from the bottom of a trench, reported in January 1983, indicated the presence of 63,000 ppb of xylenes. Results of analyses on water samples

from previously and currently existing wells indicate that TCE was detected in concentrations ranging from 8.7 to 71 ppb. The source of TCE in the groundwater beneath this portion of the site has not been identified. Xylene was not detected in the groundwater in this area. Recent results indicated nondetectable (ND) levels of xylenes and other VOCs currently exist in the soil.

Other VOCs and chemicals were also detected in the soil. Other VOCs were also detected in the groundwater. TCE has repeatedly been detected over the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) in the well located in the northeast corner of the Site (OW-5). Results of analysis on a water sample from OW-11, north of the ABOVE GROUND TANK AREA, reported in January 1989, indicated the presence of 73 ppb of benzene which is above the MCL for benzene. Currently, there are 30 wells onsite and offsite; 15 wells have been properly destroyed.

8. INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTIONS Interim remedial actions have been implemented in the METALS, HMBA, and FORMER BURIED TRENCH AREAS. These actions include soil excavation and removal, and installation of a dewatering system.

In the FORMER BURIED TRENCH AREA, the waste materials and polluted soil were excavated and removed in 1983 under Department of Health Services (DHS) supervision and found to be acceptable to DHS. The Board, however, presumes that this interim remedial action may not be protective of groundwater quality because soil analysis results indicate that most, but not all, of the affected soil was removed. VOCs were ND in soil analyses performed in 1988.

In the HMBA AREA, a dewatering system was installed in 1982. The system consists of a subsurface trench which drains to a sump. HMBA levels in the sump have been ND since April 1987. HMBA levels in the sampled wells in this vicinity have decreased to ND. Currently, the volume of water pumped to the sewer from the sump is reported to be less than 6 gallons per minute or 9000 gallons per day. Monsanto has proposed to cease operation of this system.

In the METALS AREA, excavation of metals-polluted soil was conducted by Hunter in February 1989. This work revealed that the extent of metals pollution was not defined, as previously thought. Additional borings and sampling analyses have recently been proposed by Hunter to further characterize the pollution in the metals area.

Monsanto recently proposed to install an extraction/treatment/reinfiltration

system, to address the TCE groundwater plume onsite, on the eastern portion of the Site. The proposed system includes an extraction trench along part of the northern boundary of the Site, an extraction well near the METALS AREA and a reinfiltration trench along part of the eastern boundary. They also proposed a vapor extraction system to remediate soil pollution in the ABOVE GROUND TANK AREA. These proposed measures may impact, but are not designed to remediate, any pollution detected/monitored in the HMBA or FORMER BURIED TRENCH AREAS. A workplan describing the proposal in detail is expected to be submitted on August 28, 1989. This workplan must be acceptable to the Executive Officer.

9. SCOPE OF THIS ORDER This order contains tasks for completion of groundwater characterization, implementation and evaluation of interim remedial actions, and preparation and implementation of final remedial actions. These tasks are necessary to alleviate the threat to the environment posed by the migration of the groundwater plume of pollutants and to provide a substantive technical basis for designing and evaluating the effectiveness of final cleanup alternatives. Adoption of this order rescinds Orders 85-93 and 88-48 previously adopted for this Site.

10. The Board adopted a revised Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin (Basin Plan) on December 16, 1986. The Basin Plan contains water quality objectives and beneficial uses for South San Francisco Bay and contiguous surface and groundwaters.

11. The existing and potential beneficial uses of the groundwater underlying and adjacent to the facility include:

    a. Industrial process water supply
    b. Industrial service water supply
    c. Municipal and Domestic water supply
    d. Agricultural water supply

12. The dischargers have caused or permitted, and threatens to cause or permit waste to be discharged or deposited where it is or probably will be discharged to waters of the State and creates or threatens to create a condition of pollution or nuisance.

13. This action is an order to enforce the laws and regulations administered by the Board. This action is categorically exempt from the provisions of the CEQA pursuant to Section 15321 of the Resources Agency Guidelines.

14. The Board has notified the dischargers and interested agencies and persons of its intent under California Water Code Section 13304 to prescribe Site Cleanup

Requirements for the discharge and has provided them with the opportunity for a public hearing and an opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.

15. The Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, pursuant to Section 13304 of the California Water Code, that the discharger shall cleanup and abate the effects described in the above findings as follows:

A. PROHIBITIONS

1. The discharge of wastes or hazardous materials in a manner which will degrade water quality or adversely affect the beneficial uses of the waters of the State is prohibited.

2. Further significant migration of pollutants through subsurface transport to waters of the State is prohibited.

3. Activities associated with the subsurface investigation and cleanup which will cause significant adverse migration of pollutants are prohibited.

B. SPECIFICATIONS

1. The storage, handling, treatment or disposal of soil or groundwater containing pollutants shall not create a nuisance as defined in Section 13050(m) of the California Water Code.

2. The dischargers shall conduct site investigation, monitoring, and remediation activities as needed to define the current local hydrogeologic conditions, to define the lateral and vertical extent of soil and groundwater pollution, and to remediate soil and groundwater pollution. Should monitoring results show evidence of pollutant migration, additional characterization and remediation of pollutant extent may be required. Within 60 days of the Executive Officer's determination and actual notice to CAMSI IV that Monsanto, Hunter, and Hunter Technology Acquisition Company have failed to comply with the prohibitions, specifications, and/or provisions of this Order, CAMSI IV, as landowner, shall comply with the prohibitions, specifications, and/or provisions of this Order.

3. The cleanup goal for source-area soils is 1 ppm for total VOCs.

Alternate cleanup goals may be proposed based on site specific data. If higher levels of VOCs are proposed, the discharger must demonstrate that cleanup to 1 ppm total VOCs is infeasible, that the alternate levels will not threaten the quality of waters of the State, and that human health and the environment are protected. Final cleanup goals for source-area soils must be acceptable to the Executive Officer.

4. Final cleanup levels and goals for polluted groundwater, onsite and offsite, shall be background water quality if feasible, but shall not be greater than the DHS drinking water Action Level (AL) or MCL, whichever is more stringent. If an AL or MCL has not been established, the level shall be in accordance with the State Water Resources Control Board's Resolution No. 68-16, "Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California", based on an evaluation of the cost, effectiveness and a risk assessment to determine affect on human health and the environment, and shall be approved by the Board. These levels shall have a goal of reducing the mobility, toxicity, and volume of pollutants.

5. If groundwater extraction and treatment is considered as an alternative, the feasibility of water reuse, reinjection, and disposal to the sanitary sewer must be evaluated. Based on the Regional Board Resolution 88-160, the discharger shall optimize, with a goal of 100%, the reclamation or reuse of groundwater extracted as a result of cleanup activities. The discharger shall not be found in violation of this Order if documented factors beyond the discharger's control prevent the discharger from attaining this goal, provided the discharger has made a good faith effort to attain this goal. If reuse or reinjection is part of a proposed alternative, an application for Waste Discharge Requirements may be required. If discharge to waters of the State is part of a proposed alternative, an application for an NPDES permit must be completed and submitted, and must include the evaluation of the feasibility of water reuse, reinjection, and disposal to the sanitary sewer.

C. PROVISIONS

1. The discharger shall comply with the Prohibitions and Specifications above, in accordance with the following time schedule and tasks:

TASK/COMPLETION DATE

a. TASK: COMPLETE SOIL POLLUTION CHARACTERIZATION:

Hunter shall submit a technical report acceptable to the Executive

Officer documenting completion of the characterization and definition of the horizontal and vertical extent of soil pollution in the METALS AREA.

COMPLETION DATE: September 1, 1989

b. TASK: SUBMIT REVISED SITE SAFETY, SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS, AND QUALITY ASSURANCE PROJECT PLANS:

Monsanto shall submit updated Site Safety, Sampling and Analysis, and Quality Assurance Project Plans acceptable to the Executive Officer, and with format and content that considers CERCLA guidance documents.

COMPLETION DATE: October 31, 1989

c. TASK: COMPLETE GROUNDWATER POLLUTION CHARACTERIZATION:

Monsanto shall submit a technical report acceptable to the Executive Officer documenting the completion of additional work proposed to define the vertical extent of the onsite groundwater pollution near the METALS AREA.

COMPLETION DATE: October 31, 1989

d. 1) TASK: EVALUATE INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTIONS FOR SOILS IN THE METALS AREA:

Hunter shall submit a technical report acceptable to the Executive Officer documenting an evaluation of the effectiveness of the remediation of soils in the METALS AREA.

COMPLETION DATE: November 1, 1989

2) TASK: COMPLETE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTIONS FOR THE TCE GROUNDWATER PLUME AND FOR THE SOILS IN THE ABOVE GROUND TANK AREA:

Monsanto shall submit a technical report acceptable to the Executive Officer documenting the implementation of interim remedial actions, as proposed in the workplan described in Finding 8 of this Order and accepted by the Executive Officer, to remediate the TCE groundwater

plume and to remediate soils in the ABOVE GROUND TANK AREA.

COMPLETION DATE: August 31, 1990

e. 1) TASK: EVALUATE INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTIONS:

Monsanto shall submit a technical report acceptable to the Executive Officer which evaluates the effectiveness of the interim onsite groundwater remediation system and of the soils remediation activities in the ABOVE GROUND TANK AREA. Such an evaluation shall include, but need not be limited to, an estimation of the flow capture zone of the extraction trench and wells, description of the effectiveness of the hydraulic containment achieved by operation of the infiltration trench, establishment of the cones of depression by field measurements, and presentation of chemical monitoring data. Additionally, this report should summarize the groundwater monitoring results (including at least three sampling events) for the HMBA AREA after operation of the dewatering system is terminated, and should summarize the groundwater monitoring results (including at least three sampling events) for the FORMER BURIED TRENCH AREA and discuss whether or not the results indicate an offsite source of VOCs.

COMPLETION DATE: January 31, 1991

2) TASK: PROPOSE MODIFICATIONS TO INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTIONS:

Submit a technical report acceptable to the Executive Officer which specifies modifications to the interim remedial actions and proposes an implementation time schedule in the event that the soil or groundwater remediation system is demonstrated not to be effective in containing and removing the onsite pollutants.

COMPLETION DATE: January 31, 1991

f. TASK: COMPLETE MODIFICATIONS TO INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTIONS:

Submit a technical report acceptable to the Executive Officer documenting completion of the necessary tasks identified in the technical report submitted for Task 1.e.2).

COMPLETION DATE: July 31, 1991

g. TASK: PROPOSED FINAL CLEANUP OBJECTIVES AND ACTIONS:

Submit a technical report acceptable to the Executive Officer that proposes final cleanup objectives and actions for all areas of the site where soil and/or groundwater pollution was detected. This report shall contain the results of the remedial investigation; an evaluation of the installed interim remedial actions; a feasibility study evaluating alternative final remedial actions; the recommended actions necessary to achieve final cleanup objectives; and the tasks and time schedule necessary to implement the recommended final remedial actions.

COMPLETION DATE: January 31, 1992

h. TASK: COMPLETE IMPLEMENTATION OF FINAL CLEANUP ACTIONS:

Submit a technical report acceptable to the Executive Officer documenting the implementation of final cleanup actions as proposed and accepted by the Executive Officer in accordance with Task g. above.

COMPLETION DATE: January 31, 1993

i. TASK: SUBMIT FIVE YEAR STATUS REPORT:

Submit a technical report acceptable to the Executive Officer containing the following: 1) results of any additional investigative work needed; 2) an evaluation of the effectiveness of installed final cleanup measures; 3) additional recommended measures to achieve final cleanup objectives and goals, if necessary; 4) a comparison of previous expected costs with the costs incurred and projected costs necessary to achieve cleanup objectives and goals; 5) the tasks and time schedule necessary to implement any additional final cleanup measures; and 6) recommended measures for reducing Board oversight. This report shall also describe the reuse of extracted groundwater, evaluate and document the removal and/or cleanup of polluted groundwater, and evaluate and document the removal and/or cleanup of polluted soil. If safe drinking water levels have not been achieved through continued groundwater extraction and/or soil remediation, this report shall also contain an evaluation addressing whether it is technically feasible to achieve drinking-water quality onsite, and if so, a proposal for procedures to do so.

COMPLETION DATE: August 31, 1994

2. The submittal of technical reports evaluating interim and final remedial measures will include a projection of the cost, effectiveness, benefits, and impact on public health, welfare, and environment of each alternative measure. The remedial investigation and feasibility study shall consider the guidance provided by Subpart F of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (40 CFR Part 300); Section 25356.1 (c) of the California Health and Safety Code; CERCLA guidance documents with reference to Remedial Investigation, Feasibility Studies, and Removal Actions; and the State Water Resources Control Board's Resolution No. 68-16, "Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California".

3. If the discharger(s) are delayed, interrupted or prevented from meeting one or more of the completion dates specified in this Order, the discharger(s) shall promptly notify the Executive Officer and the Board may consider revision to this Order.

4. The discharger shall submit to the Regional Board acceptable reports on compliance with the requirements of this Order, and acceptable activity monitoring reports that contain descriptions and results of work performed. These reports are to be submitted according to a program prescribed by the Regional Board and outlined below.

   a. ON A MONTHLY BASIS, technical reports on status of compliance with this Order shall be submitted to the Board, commencing on September 15, 1989. Each report shall cover the previous month and shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

   1) Summary of work completed since submittal of the previous report, and work projected to be completed by the time of the next report.

   2) Identification of any obstacles which may threaten compliance with the schedule of this Order and what actions are being taken to overcome these obstacles.

   3) Written notification which clarifies the reasons for non-compliance with any requirement of this Order, and which proposes specific measures and a schedule to achieve compliance. This written notification shall identify work not completed that was projected for completion, and shall identify the impact of non-compliance on achieving compliance with the remaining requirements of this Order.

   b. ON A BIANNUAL BASIS (TWICE EACH YEAR), technical reports

on groundwater monitoring shall be submitted to the Board, commencing on January 15, 1990, and covering the previous six months. The biannual reports may include the monthly reports due concurrently, beginning with the January 15, 1989 monthly report included in the January 15, 1990 biannual report. The biannual reports shall include, but need not be limited to, the following information:

1) Results of biannual water quality sampling analyses for the wells listed using the analytical method specified, and groundwater pollution plume maps based on these results.

WELLS	METHODS
OW-1 through OW-16, OW-1B, 19A	8010, 8020
OW-10, OW-11	8270[1]
9, 12 or 13, 14 or 10A, 18A	8010, 8020, 8270
BTW-1 through BTW-3	8010

1) Analysis by this method is only required once each year. The first biannual report shall include the results of this analytical method on these two wells.

2) Quarterly updated water table and piezometric surface maps, based on the most recent quarterly water level measurements for all affected water bearing zones for all onsite and offsite wells, in coordination with the adjacent Technical Coatings site. Water level measurements in the HMBA AREA must be monthly, at least until the technical report for TASK 1.e.1: EVALUATION OF INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTIONS is submitted. The first set of data shall be reported in the biannual report due January 15, 1990.

3) A cumulative tabulation of volume of extracted groundwater, chemical analysis results for all groundwater extraction wells, pounds of chemicals removed; a cumulative tabulation of volume of extracted soil vapor, chemical analysis results for all soil vapor extraction wells, pounds of chemicals removed.

4) A cumulative tabulation of all well construction details, and quarterly water level measurements.

5) Reference diagrams including geologic cross-sections describing the hydrogeological setting of the Site, and appropriately scaled and detailed base maps showing the location of all monitoring wells and extraction wells, and identifying adjacent facilities and structures.

6) Identification and notification of non-compliance with groundwater monitoring requirements of this Order, as described in Provisions 4.A.2. and 4.A.3.

c. ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, technical reports on the progress of compliance with all requirements of this Order shall be submitted to the Board, commencing on January 15, 1991, and covering the previous year. Annual reports may include monthly and biannual reports due concurrently. The progress reports shall include, but need not be limited to, progress on the site investigation and remedial actions, operation of interim and final remedial actions and /or systems, and the feasibility of meeting groundwater and soil cleanup goals.

5. All hydrogeological plans, specifications, reports, and documents shall be signed by or stamped with the seal of a registered geologist, engineering geologist or professional engineer.

6. All samples shall be analyzed by State certified laboratories or laboratories accepted by the Board using approved EPA methods for the type of analysis to be performed. All laboratories shall maintain Quality Assurance/Quality Control records for Board review.

7. The discharger(s) shall maintain in good working order, and operate, as efficiently as possible, any facility or control system installed to achieve compliance with the requirements of this Order.

8. Copies of all correspondence, reports, and documents pertaining to compliance with the Prohibitions, Specifications, and Provisions of this Order, shall be provided to the following agencies:

   a. Santa Clara Valley Water District (Tom Iwamura)
   b. Santa Clara County Health Department (Lee Esquibel)
   c. City of Santa Clara (Dave Parker)
   d. State Department of Health Services/TSCD (Howard Hatayama)

9. The discharger(s) shall permit the Board or its authorized representative, in accordance with Section 13267(c) of the California Water Code:

a. Entry upon premises in which any pollution sources exist, or may potentially exist, or in which any required records are kept, which are relevant to this Order.

b. Access to copy any records required to be kept under the terms and conditions of this Order.

c. Inspection of any monitoring equipment or methodology implemented in response to this Order.

d. Sampling of any groundwater or soil which is accessible, or may become accessible, as part of any investigation or remedial action program undertaken by the discharger.

10. The current property owner shall file a report on any changes in Site occupancy and ownership associated with the facility described in this Order.

11. If any hazardous substance is discharged in or on any waters of the state, or discharged and deposited where it is, or probably will be discharged in or on any waters of the state, the discharger shall report such discharge to this Regional Board, at (415) 464-1255 on weekdays during office hours from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., and to the Office of Emergency Services at (800) 852-7550 during non-business hours. A written report shall be filed with the Regional Board within five (5) working days and shall contain information relative to: the nature of waste or pollutant, quantity involved, duration of incident, cause of spill, Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan (SPCC) in effect, if any, estimated size of affected area, nature of effect, corrective measures that have been taken or planned, and a schedule of these activities, and persons/agencies notified.

12. This Order supersedes the existing Orders 85-93 and 88-48. Orders 85-93 and 88-48 are hereby rescinded with adoption of this Order.

13. The Board will review this Order periodically and may revise the requirements when necessary.

I, Steven R. Ritchie, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, on August 16,1989.

Steven R. Ritchie
Executive Officer